



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,609	09/28/2004	Jitendra K. Bhalgat	03292.102040	5608
66569 7590 09/03/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
TIEU, BINH KIEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,609

Applicant(s)

BHARGAT ET AL.

Examiner

BINH K. TIEU

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6, 9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraffert (US. Pat. #: 6,625,598).

Regarding claim 1, Kraffert teaches a computer-implemented method to facilitate auditing of data in a database, the method comprising:

entering first data into a first database (i.e., new entries, such as order number “83250” and charge class of “Freight” into database 44, as shown in figures 1 and 2; see col.3, lines 47-67);

entering second data into at least one second database (i.e., the same order number and “Freight” are transferred to the accounting database 46, see col.2, line 53 through col.3, line 5);

receiving screen data (i.e., receiving an order number and/or “Freight”) for navigating to a location of said first data (i.e., a row that includes the order number and/or a charge class of “Freight”, col.4, lines 59-65);

issuing a command for navigating to said location of said first data based on said screen data (i.e., a server issuing a Structure Query Language (SQL) query to the database 44, col.4,

lines 61 through col.5, line 3); and,

comparing said first data and said second data (i.e., comparing accounting charge data elements stored in both computer 20 and subsystem 13) to determine if said first data and said second data are substantially similar prior to an authorization for a transaction (col.5, lines 16-30 and col.5, line 62 through col.6, line 17).

Regarding claim 2, note col.5, line 62 through col.6, line 4.

Regarding claim 3, note col.2, lines 53-65.

Regarding claims 4-5, note col.4, line 61 through col.5, line 3.

Regarding claim 6, note col.3, lines 20-38.

Regarding claim 9, note col.2, line 66 through col.3, line 5.

Regarding claim 11, Kraffert teaches a computer-implemented method to facilitate auditing of rate data in a database, the method comprising:

entering first data into a first database (i.e., new entries, such as order number "83250" and charge class of "Freight" into database 44, as shown in figures 1 and 2; see col.3, lines 47-67);

entering second data into at least one second database (i.e., the same order number and "Freight" are transferred to the accounting database 46, see col.2, line 53 through col.3, line 5);

receiving screen data (i.e., receiving an order number and/or "Freight") for navigating to a location of said first data (i.e., a row that includes the order number and/or a charge class of "Freight", col.4, lines 59-65);

issuing a command for navigating to said location of said first data based on said screen data (i.e., a server issuing a Structure Query Language (SQL) query to the database 44, col.4,

lines 61 through col.5, line 3); and,

comparing said first data and said second data (i.e., comparing accounting charge data elements stored in both computer 20 and subsystem 13) to determine if said first data and said second data are substantially similar (col.5, lines 16-30 and col.5, line 62 through col.6, line 17).

Regarding claim 12, note col.2, lines 53-65.

Regarding claim 13, Kraffert teaches a system configured to facilitate auditing of data in a database, the system comprising:

first database having first data (i.e., new entries, such as order number "83250" and charge class of "Freight" into database 44, as shown in figures 1 and 2; see col.3, lines 47-67);

at least one second database having second data (i.e., the same order number and "Freight" are transferred to the accounting database 46, see col.2, line 53 through col.3, line 5);

a rate tracking (RT) server (i.e., server 40, col.4, lines 61-65) configuring to comparing said first data and said second data (i.e., comparing accounting charge data elements stored in both computer 20 and subsystem 13) to determine if said first data and said second data are substantially similar prior to an authorization for a transaction (col.5, lines 16-30 and col.5, line 62 through col.6, line 17).

wherein said RT server configured to receive screen data (i.e., receiving an order number and/or "Freight") for navigating to a location of said first data (i.e., a row that includes the order number and/or a charge class of "Freight", col.4, lines 59-65);

wherein said RT server configured to issue a command for navigating to said location of said first data based on said screen data (i.e., a server issuing a Structure Query Language (SQL) query to the database 44, col.4, lines 61 through col.5, line 3); and,

Regarding claims 14-16, Kraffert further teaches that as new entries in the database 44 accumulate, the entries are transferred to the database 46 for processing by the accounting program 42b. Kraffert further teaches that when customer return merchandise to a company, the row 102d reflects the transaction by the entry of return merchandise authorization code in the charge class column 100c and the refunded amount in column 100f. The amount of the refund is debited from Account Number 9 in column 100e (col.4, lines 9-16). These are different patterns to update data in the databases 44 and 46 in accordance to screen data such as returned merchandise.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraffert (US. Pat. #: 6,625,598) in view of Pintsov (Pub. No.: US 2003/0036918, *as cited in the previous Office Action*).

Claim 7, Kraffert teaches all subject matter as claimed above, except for step of negotiating a rate related to travel related services. However, Pintsov teaches such feature in paragraph [0091] for a purpose of providing good deal to customers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of negotiating a rate related to travel related services, as taught by Pintsov, into view of Kraffert in order to search a good deal for the travel related service.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraffert (US. Pat. #: 6,625,598) in view of Seljeseth (Pub. No.: US 2004/0049446, *as cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claim 8, Kraffert teaches all subject matter as claimed above, except for step of entering first data into a first database is facilitated by a broker. However, Seljeseth teaches a seller (or a broker) can enter sale details of a car into a database see paragraph [0206] for a purpose of providing details of a merchandise to prospective buyers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of step of entering first data into a first database is facilitated by a broker, as taught by Seljeseth, into view of Kraffert in order provide details of merchandise to prospective buyers on line.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraffert (US. Pat. #: 6,625,598) in view of Foster (Pub. No.: US 2007/0043636, *also cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claim 10, Kraffert teaches all subject matter as claimed above, except for the feature of converting currency to a common currency type. However, Foster teaches such feature in paragraph [0034] for a purpose of providing service equivalent the amount of converted currency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of converting currency to a common currency type, as taught by Foster, into view of Kraffert in order to provide service equivalent the amount of converted currency.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

Art Unit: 2614

mark Or faxed to:
 (703) 872-9314 or (571) 273-8300 (for formal communications; please
 "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

 Or: If it is an informal or draft communication, please label
 "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

 Hand Carry Deliveries to:
 Customer Service Window
 (Randolph Building)
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. If you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: August 2008